

March 11, 2011

NEPA Manager
Arizona Strip District
Bureau of Land Management
345 East Riverside Drive
St. George, UT 84790

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
ARIZONA STRIP FIELD OFFICE
MAR 17 2011

Re: EIS on Uranium Mining on Federal Lands in the Vicinity of Grand Canyon
National Park

Dear NEPA Manager/Coordinator:

It would be a tragic mistake to close the subject federal lands to mineral entry and uranium mining. The environmental effects of these activities have been grossly exaggerated by the NGOs and the real potential effects can be readily managed. The NGOs do not care about the adverse economic and social consequences of their positions and actions – they just want to chalk-up yet another destructive victory against the minerals industry.

The USA desperately needs new, reliable baseload electric power generation and transmission that is economic, clean and allows us to preserve our carbon based natural resources for more precious future uses where electricity is not a viable substitute.

I urge you to decide against closing the northern Arizona public lands to uranium exploration, mine development and production.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Charles G. Johnson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized "C" and "J".

Charles G. Johnson

Please complete the following:

Name _____



Mark Grenard
12810 N. Cave Creek Rd. Apt. 105
Phoenix, AZ 85022

Address

Phoenix, AZ 85022

E-mail Address

gregardmarkhayduke@yahoo.com

10

Withhold my name and address from public review

☒

I want to be added to a mailing list to receive information via e-mail during the FEIS preparation

1

I want to be added to a mailing list to receive information via regular mail during the FEIS preparation

Please provide substantive comments, factual information, and other constructive input to help improve the DEIS. Attach additional pages if necessary.

I support Alternative B, the full withdrawal of 1 million acres of land around the Grand Canyon. This will protect the seeps and watershed of the Colorado River, from which millions of people depend on for their drinking water. It will also preserve the natural quiet of the Grand Canyon for all visitors.

Alternative B will also preserve tribal lands from the ravages of mining and destroying their watersheds.

Sincerely,

Mark Hayduke Greer And

Public Comment Form

Please complete the following:

Name Valarie A. Bryant

Address 1300 N. Indian Springs Lane
Flagstaff, Arizona 86004

E-mail Address _____

☐

Withhold my name and address from public review

☒

I want to be added to a mailing list to receive information via e-mail during the FEIS preparation *assuming your e mail address is NAF proposed withdrawal @ asblm.org. I NOT please send you*

☐

I want to be added to a mailing list to receive information via regular mail during the FEIS preparation

e mail address via regular mail, as my e mail has a high security component

Please provide substantive comments, factual information, and other constructive input to help improve the DEIS.

Attach additional pages if necessary.

In reading through the EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
and TABLE 2.8-1 Summary of Potential Environmental
Impacts by Alternative, it seems, even though
the ^{entire} study was very well prepared, that this is still a
"Best guess" scenario. Almost all the impact statements
contain the phrases; 1) are not able to be determined, 2) if any impact
would occur, 3) Impacts could range from 4) Changes might be
large 5) Impacts on — are possible, depending on 6) may
impact, 7) would depend on 8) Assuming that 9) could result
10) depend on. You are, therefore, saying that you just do not
know! Is there a study or studies, on the actual impact
of uranium mining? Notwithstanding the actual location, do these
studies show that any uranium (or any other mineral) mining has
had a BENEFICIAL impact on the various components of the area (i.e.
water, soil, wild life, vegetation, etc resources). My "Best guess" is
that mining usually always has a negative effect on at least some of the
resources. How about presenting known FACTS on mining effects.

seems to support the fact that the negative effect of uranium mining is

I support the full withdrawal of all segregation areas on the plateaus around Grand Canyon National Park from uranium mining, for at least 20 years.

I oppose the destruction of natural habitat and firmly believe that to do so will negatively impact the wildlife and human populations in the surrounding region. Please do not give OUR LAND to people who do not and will not care for it and it's life. Thank you for listening.



FROM:
(address must
be included)

Charles Jost
PO Box 7432
Flagstaff, AZ 86001

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
ZONA STRIP FIELD OFFICE

TO: MAR 17 2011

Northern Arizona Proposed Withdrawal Project
ATTN: Scott Florence, District Manager
Bureau of Land Management,
Arizona Strip District
345 E. Riverside Drive
St. George, UT 84790-6714



Lo I and Won Yin
3152 Gracefield Road #323
Silver Spring, MD 20904

March 12, 2011 **BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT**
ARIZONA STRIP FIELD OFFICE

Northern Arizona Withdrawal Project
Attn: Scott Florence, BLM District Manager
345 E. Riverside Drive
St. George, UT 84790-6714

MAR 17 2011

Dear Mr. Florence:

Please consider this letter as our comment supporting Alternative B, a protective withdrawal to prevent further mining claims on 1 million acres at the Grand Canyon. We want to thank Secretary Ken Salazar for the two-year "time out" he has already imposed on the same area, and we compliment BLM on the thorough analysis in the environmental impact statement.

Too much of the Grand Canyon has already been compromised by mining claims. The mining laws give far too much power to the holder of a claim, to the extent that neither BLM nor the Forest Service could reject a mining development, as long as the claimant has found a valuable mineral deposit. The public interest is not protected.

We have a map of the proposed withdrawal area at hand. The areas to be protected are integral parts of the Grand Canyon, occupying tributary watersheds such as Kanab Creek, Hack Canyon, and House Rock Wash. Alternatives A, C and D would leave too many of those areas exposed to mining, leading to an estimated 14 to 26 new mines and up to 728 exploration projects. The Grand Canyon deserves better.

In the final decision, we would like to see a statement of what BLM will do to identify and cancel fraudulent mining claims – those that have no valuable mineral deposit. We would not be surprised if most of the existing claims were bogus.

Please convey our thanks to Secretary Salazar for this constructive proposal. Thank you for this opportunity to participate.

Sincerely yours,

Lo I Yin
Won O. Yin

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
ARIZONA STRIP FIELD OFFICE

MAR 17 2011

Ms. Irene Lopez
4986 Field St
San Diego
CA 92110

Dear Secy Ken Salazar.

The draft environmental impact statement for the Northern Arizona Proposed Mineral Withdrawal includes four alternatives: only one of these, Alternative B, affords protection from new uranium mines across Grand Canyon's entire 1-million-acre watershed. I support the full 1-million-acre protection afforded by Alternative B. Please support Alternative B!! I would be most grateful & would appreciate a kind reply. Sincerely, J. H. Lopez